United Nations S/2010/358

Security Council

Distr.: General
6 July 2010

Original: English

Letter dated 6 July 2010 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith the answer given by the spokesman of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the question put by the Korean Central News Agency on 6 July 2010 with regard to the United States argument that the "Cheonan" incident be discussed at the "Military Armistice Commission" (MAC) (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) **Sin** Son Ho
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

10-43798 (E) 060710

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 6 July 2010 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Answer by the spokesman of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the question put by the Korean Central News Agency on 6 July 2010 with regard to the United States argument that the "Cheonan" incident be discussed at the "Military Armistice Commission"

The United States has placed the south Korean authorities at the head in its persistent demand that the "Cheonan" incident be discussed at the "Military Armistice Commission" (MAC), alleging that this incident constitutes a "violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement".

It is a historical fact known to the world that the Korean Armistice Agreement, from the moment of its signature, became subject to systematic violation and abrogation by the United States.

The United States has systematically abrogated essential elements of the Korean Armistice Agreement; it violated paragraph 60 of the Armistice Agreement stipulating that a political conference of a higher level be held to settle through negotiation the questions of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea and the peaceful settlement of the Korean question. It also went on to violate paragraph 13 of the Armistice Agreement banning the introduction of equipment for military operations from outside of Korea.

In 1991, the United States made the unilateral decision to designate an army "general" of south Korea, which is neither party to the Armistice Agreement nor a member of the "United Nations Command", as the senior member of the "United Nations Command" side to "MAC" and eluded its responsibility from that seat, thus completely paralysing MAC.

The United States has already destroyed by itself the Armistice Agreement and its mechanism. It does not stand to reason that the United States is now trying to take them into the "Cheonan" incident.

Herein lies an ulterior aim sought by the United States.

As time goes by, growing suspicion about the "results of investigation" announced by the south Korean authorities continues to spread across the world, whereas the international community is expressing greater sympathy with our proposal to send an inspection team.

Being cornered, the United States and the south Korean authorities are playing cheap tricks with the issue of a consultation forum in an attempt to block the involvement of our inspection team and blur the truth behind their fabricated plot.

The United States wanted to take advantage of the fact that we do not recognize "MAC" and came up with the idea of "discussion at the MAC"; however, it is a miscalculation.

The United States argues that the incident can be discussed at "MAC" because there is a "precedent of Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States general-level talks" dealing with violations of the Armistice Agreement.

However, the truth behind the "Cheonan incident" has not been unveiled yet; hence, as of this moment, we cannot even talk about a violation of the Armistice Agreement.

We have already clarified our position as regards this matter; an inspection team of the National Defence Commission must be sent to uncover the truth of the incident; working-level contacts for north-south high-level military talks must be made to this end.

The Security Council should abide by the principle of objectivity and impartiality so as to distinguish truth from falsehood and take heed of our proposal aimed at giving priority to the work of getting to the bottom of the incident.